DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 565 PS 011 429

AUTHOR Calhoun, John A.
TITLE The Family Advisory Committee: A Powerful New Tool for Massachusetts.
PUB DATE 14 Sep 79
NOTE 41p.; Parts may be marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Committees; *Family (Sociological Unit); *Government Role; Guidelines; *Policy Formation; Public Policy; Social Agencies; Social Problems; *Social Services; *State Action

ABSTRACT

Through a review of basic literature in the family policy field, recent state documents and budget submissions, this paper was compiled to give direction to the Massachusetts Advisory Committee on Families. The formation of the Committee is examined in Part One of this paper and it is argued that the committee should not engage in endless family policy debates but should serve as an instrument through which all state-funded activity is viewed. Part Two is a summary of the basic literature. Reasons why the family has been neglected, why social services are in confusion and why, to the detriment of both children and their families, attention has been focused primarily on the child are traced. Part Three explores why the family is currently the subject of much national and international concern. Parts Four and Five provide, first, a framework of principles work and, second, a detailed set of sample questions the Committee might ask of each State Agency during and as an integral part of the State's annual budget cycle. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED202565

THE FAMILY ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

A POWERFUL NEW TOOL FOR MASSACHUSETTS

John A. Calhoun

September 14, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Harold Eidlin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS011429

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface.....i

I. A Proposal.....1

II. Background: Forces Working Against a Family Focus.....4

III. Reasons for the Present Concern.....16

IV. Principles - A Framework for Inquiry.....20

V. Sample Questions.....26

VI. Conclusion.....31

PREFACE

Through a review of basic literature in the family policy field, recent State documents and budget submissions, it is the intent of this paper to give direction to the Advisory Committee on Families which was recently appointed by Governor King. The Committee's presence provides Massachusetts with a remarkable opportunity to improve the way the State looks at and deals with its families.

In Part One (I) I look at the formation of the Committee. Here I reveal my central theme, namely that the Committee should not bog itself down in endless family policy debates but should decide to serve as a lens, a family lens through which all State-funded activity is viewed.

Part Two (II) is a summary of the basic literature. In this section I trace the reasons why we have neglected the family, why our social services are in such a muddle and why, to the detriment of both children and their families, we have focused our attention only on the child.

Part Three (III) brings us to the present. I explore why the family is currently the subject of so much national and international concern.

Parts Four (IV) and Five (V) provide first a framework of principles within which the Committee might work and then a detailed set of sample questions the Committee might ask of each State Agency during and as an integral part of the State's annual budget cycle.

My conclusion is that the idea is eminently practical. It would take very little to set it in motion.

To help us sensibly structure our State-funded activities in a way that allows families to be the best that they can be is the core message of this paper.

The thrilling fact is that it can work.

I. A Proposal

> Because I am deeply concerned about families in crisis, I am committed to developing some long-range objectives that will help prevent such serious family problems as child abuse, wife beating, alcoholism, mental illness resulting from or causing family stress, unemployment (due to lack of adequate vocational training), teenage pregnancies, emotional traumas resulting from divorce, death or separation, displaced homemakers, etc. To study these issues, I am establishing a Family Committee that will submit a report to me outlining:
>
> 1. The duties of all State agencies in any area having an impact on family life, whether as crisis intervention programs or long-range preventative measures;
>
> 2. The costs of the programs, including the sources of funds and the disbursement procedures;
>
> 3. Data regarding the numbers of citizens affected by each program (including eligibility criteria and methods of providing services);
>
> 4. Recommendations for action (both inter-agency and intra-agency).[1]

With this memo the new Governor of the State of Massachusetts, Edward J. King, launched the family initiative promised during his campaign. Proponent and signatory of what is probably the stiffest anti-abortion law in the nation, champion of mandatory sentencing and the death penalty, Governor King has never hidden his conservative views from anyone.

Although he has aggressively started to explore family policy matters for the State, one might question whether such a policy move represents an ideological shift to the left. The answer is an unequivocal no - at least at this point. Governor King's views on families are perfectly consonant with his conservative philosophy. It is safe to say that he sees himself as the conservator of the intact family, a churchgoing family, a family with one parent at home (the mother) caring for the needs of the children and other family members.

He is very worried about soaring divorce rates; he is concerned about inadequate parenting in the home; he is bothered that the State is not helping the family enough (and he wants to know why this is so), and he feels in some instances the State might be getting in the way of effective family functioning.[2]

The Governor's worry about the state of the family has manifested itself in the formation of the Advisory Committee on Children and the Family (the Committee). The Committee, chaired by Armand Nicholi, M.D., includes members of the clergy, teachers, individuals who administer programs for children and families, prominent child health professionals and family experts. Interestingly, some of the Committee members are divorcees. In spite of the absence of a lawyer and a tax professional or economist (plumbing the family issue leads unerringly to questions of family and children's "rights" and to income support issues), the Committee is impressive. It is of extremely high calibre, it cares about children and families and it is taking its task very seriously.

The problem is that the Committee is uncertain about its central mission. This is not an indictment, for the Committee has only met twice and is now wrestling with the question of what course it should take.

It is the purpose of this paper to help the Committee define its role vis-a-vis the State. It is suggested in this paper that the Committee serve as a lens for the Governor through which all state-funded activity is viewed. Under this proposal, the Committee would not have line authority, would not serve as a new Department of Families (everything the State does directly or indirectly affects families) and it would not promulgate policy. The Committee would, just precedent to a State agency's annual budget submission to the Governor, hold hearings with each Secretary, Commissioner, Department Head or Chief Justice, asking that program budgets and agency goals be explained

in terms of their effects upon families. The Committee would examine how agency programs, policies and goals may be contributing to family difficulties and would encourage programs that would strengthen families and permanency for children. The impact upon agencies should be immediate: What is Welfare doing to insure that children are not capriciously yanked from their homes and put in foster care; are the Department of Youth Service group homes accessible so that the parents of delinquent youth can visit their children; is an AFDC mother able to receive requisite pre-natal care; does sufficient public transportation exist between low-income areas (always showing the highest rate of family collapse) and job sites; are Probate Court judges given training sufficient to help them resolve child custody disputes? These are only a handful of the hundreds of questions that might be asked during the annual hearings. (Note: For the purposes of this paper, family will be defined as a group of two or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption and residing together. Because this definition permits a great deal of latitude [elderly couples, gay marriages, etc.] at least one of the "two or more persons" will be considered either a child or an adolescent.)

A staff to the Committee of only modest size could prepare questions in advance, could formulate the budget critique and could then draft the Committee's recommendation to the Governor following the hearings. The Committee would thereby be spared the almost impossible task of designing a comprehensive family policy for the State, but would, by its questions, imply policy or at a minimum, a perspective.

It is a modest proposal. It is a proposal that should save the Committee and the State a great deal of agony and time, for if the Committee undertakes as its first task questions of policy (e.g., a child's right to adequate health care) it could detour into an area of dispute rivaled in intensity

and complexity only by Talmudic discussions and it will have failed in its first task which is to inquire how the State has shaped the family, intentionally and unintentionally, and why. Even if agreement were reached, it is doubtful how affordable its conclusions would be in this era of inflation.

Family policy discussions can derail for financial reasons. We would be wise to listen to Laurence Lynn's caveat:

> ...unless proponents of family policy shed a great many of their ambitions, we shall not have a family policy in this country; organizational and resource considerations strongly favor the aged, the handicapped, the disabled, and other individuals with specific needs. Even a focused, restricted, and affordable definition - one consistent with the reductionist tendencies of the policymaking process and with the competition for resources from other deserving groups - has only a limited chance of success.[3]

Finally, for reasons of our nation's pluralism, we should be wary of family policy discussions. We should heed the advice of the Family Impact Seminar:

> Because we respect the wide diversity of families and the sensitive and personal nature of family life, we oppose the idea of enacting a uniform, comprehensive national family policy.[4]

If the Committee first tackles family policy it will almost certainly squander an absolutely invaluable opportunity for the State. But if the Committee provides a perspective from which family policy may be viewed, its presence will have an immediate and measurable impact upon key state agencies and units of government.

II. Background: Forces Working Against a Family Focus

> My child has been seen by the School Adjustment Counselor, by the Welfare worker, by his Probation Officer and now by you people. Why the hell didn't nobody talk to me?[5]

The quote above is but one tiny piece of a large and frightening mosaic depicting local, state and national neglect - even abuse - of families. The

Children's Defense Fund, never an agency to mince words, is profoundly disturbed:

> What we have found and detail in this report is a national disgrace - a pattern of institutional abuse and neglect of our most vulnerable children that cannot wait one more day for correction. The daily plight of these children, often left family-less, makes a mockery of our professed belief in family...[6]

Tradition, funding patterns, lack of monitoring, a narrow individualistic focus and a host of other reason combine to keep children away from natural support mechanisms, allow for exorbitantly expensive programs for children out of the home (and, conversely, almost none in the home), inhibit family reunification efforts, stall adoption proceedings and consign thousands of children to the limbo of foster care or indeterminate stays in group residences and nursing homes. If we are worried about what happens to our children, we must worry about families:

> Much of what happens (good and bad) to shape the development of children occurs, then, in the home and the surrounding environment of their early years. The Committee concludes, therefore, that a national policy for child development must be based first and foremost on supports for the family.[7]

We have neglected the family, but a single villain is difficult to find. It may simply be a perspective - we just do not think of families. But why don't we? The answer to this question is difficult to pin down but reasonably sound guesses can be made. These conjectures follow.

A. Save the Child (Children, Not Families)

Much of social work is based on a certain latent messianism - "Save the child!" Although certainly not an illegitimate motive, such a stance does not take into consideration the family context in which the child moves. We can be a fairly altruistic people, and we become outraged at what happens to children and youth. Landmark child labor laws and abuse and neglect statutes have followed this outrage. Programs follow that outrage

too but they are programs built upon the individual, usually apart from family and community. We as a people are also given to bouts of scapegoating. We have often fixed our impatience and distress on youth as a class - our own children have been seen as "a problem." Whatever the stimulus, altruism or fear, there is a tragically clear cost calculus: The further the child is from home, the greater the amount we as a society are willing to pay for the care and treatment of that child.

Undergirding our clinical practice lies a one-to-one focus. Freud, the taproot of most twentieth century clinical practice, believed that most psychological problems, although having their genesis in family problems, are resolved not in the context of the family but in the context of a doctor with his or her patient. Freud's fundamental assumption is that individual problems can be solved by changing the individual. Society, however, is not quite so tractable. "Psychiatry will do us a disservice if it turns us from public issues to private matters. A psychiatry without social analysis is hollow"[8], asserts Featherstone.

The notion of personal independence seems basic to how we have viewed ourselves as a people: Society as

> ...a voluntary assembly of independent and self-sufficient individuals who freely contract with each other to form a community or nation was at the heart of the Enlightenment... There were moral, political and economic lessons in the ideal of the self-made man who knew no master, depended on no one and lived by his wits...this ideal assigned special virtue to personal independence...the new democratic man in America...would be free to make up his own mind and beholden to no man and no superstition.[9]

Freud's individually-centered therapy carries over to America's child-centered problem solving. The view that by saving the child from pernicious influences we thereby "fix" the child, has persisted with remarkable tenacity. When the state intervenes, the state becomes parent and rarely looks back to the natural parent. Alan Gruber's sobering description of foster care and

adoption abuses in Massachusetts proves that the state is not a particularly effective parent.[10]

B. Compounded Problems

Family work can be extraordinarily complicated. Caseworkers, when confronted with warring parents, alcoholism, joblessness, poverty, economic deprivation and a pervasive sense of familial defeat naturally choose to limit the problem to the child. Of course, when services are so designed, the child sees him or herself as the cause of the problem.

C. Absence of Ecological Thinking

Urie Bronfenbrenner in The Ecology of Human Development asserts that we must recognize that the modern American family is not an autonomous unit. The Family Impact Seminar agrees

> The theoretical base from which our values, preliminary findings and conceptual framework emerge is that of the ecology of human life and development. The core principle of this approach is the assumption that human beings need to be understood in the context of the relationships in their immediate and wider social environment.[11]

Bronfenbrenner claims that children and their families are inextricably bound to a complex of systems all of which must be examined in detail if we are to truly understand and aid the family:

> A child's ability to learn to read in the primary grades may depend no less on how he is taught than on the existence and nature of ties between the school and the home...
>
> ...the person's development is profoundly affected by events occurring in settings in which the person is not even present...
>
> ...among the most powerful influences affecting the development of young children in modern industrialized societies are the conditions of parental employment...
>
> ...whether parents can perform effectively in their child-rearing roles within the family depends on role demands, stresses and supports emanating from other settings...

> ...parents' evaluations of their own capacity to function, as well as their view of their child, are related to such external factors as flexibility of job schedules, adequacy of child care arrangements, the presence of friends and neighbors who can help out in large and small emergencies, the quality of health and social services, and neighborhood safety.[12]

Although the fate and future of children and families are linked to other systems, we as a society continue to treat both the family and the child as if they are isolated entities. Christopher Lasch worries that the family has ceeded too much of its expertise to an army of helping bureaucrats who have stripped families of their functions as workers and as parents. Education, child care, health and care for the aged have all been progressively removed from the family or neighborhood and placed under the control of state-certified experts. This is Lasch's "New paternalism."

> Yet the grounds on which sociologists defended the importance of the family - the indispensability of the emotional services it performed - simultaneously justified the transfer of its other functions to other agencies. Sociologists assumed, in fact, that urbanization made such a "transfer of functions" inevitable.[13]

Lasch is convinced that the family is no longer a "haven in a heartless world:"

> The citizen's entire existence has now been subjected to social direction, increasingly unmediated by the family or other institutions to which the work of socialization was once confined. Society itself has taken over socialization or subjected family socialization to increasingly effective control. Having thereby weakened the capacity for self-direction and self-control, it has undermined one of the principal sources of social cohesion, only to create new ones more constricting than the old, and ultimately more devastating in their impact on personal and political freedom.[14]

But we no longer grow up in pre-civil war families, living our lives on small farm, producing and preparing our own food and clothes and educating our young.

> Town governments customarily boarded the homeless, poor or juveniles with families for a fee. The first federal census, taken in 1790, showed a very small proportion of persons living alone (3.7 percent of households were of one person only, as

> compared with nearly 20 percent in 1970). Even a frontier state in 1820, peopled almost entirely by newcomers to the region saw all but 2.7 percent of its white households with two or more living together.[15]

Work has been separated from the home and society has taken on much of the responsibility for the care of children. Lasch is correct. It is unlike the past:

> In the delivery of social services there were no hospitals, asylums, or orphanages. The church in the eighteenth century had not yet taken up a social gospel mission of performing charitable activities. Nonetheless, orphans were cared for, the sick were healed (within the capacities of eighteenth-century physick), and the poor were not left to starve.. The fact that social and economic activities of a fairly high order could be carried on rested on the integration of family and economic enterprise - together with a civil polity that depended explicitly on the family and family government... The family was the unit through which virtually all major social and economic activities were mediated.[16]

This and other factors has caused the definition of parenting to change. Some would argue that the modern parent is a manager or a service broker who makes certain that his or her child receives the best in goods and services.

> A major historical development of the past century has been the creation of non-familial responses to meet the material exigencies of life. Public health clinics, workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, pensions, and the like have rendered life far more predictable and the risk-balancing role of the family far less important.[17]

The "risk-balancing role" of most families has certainly been reduced over time. However, inability to access these "non-familial responses," or in the case of the poor, afford them, means that a vast number of children grow up cheated, and parents, as a consequence, judge themselves as failures.

Featherstone seems to think that Lasch is too romantic. He confronts Lasch by speculating that urbanization and industrialization may in fact strengthen families (more leisure, more time to share child rearing, more children living beyond infancy).[18] He thinks that Lasch carries his argument

too far: Is the central problem really that professionals inflict damage upon families? "...most working class families would prefer to be invaded by a pediatrician more often...,[19] retorts Featherstone.

Whether our inter-connectedness or societal dependency is lamented (Lasch) or accepted as fact (Bronfenbrenner), our social services, in contrast, seem to rest on an anachronistic presupposition: We continue to regard children as isolated persons unconnected to parents, relatives, neighborhoods and larger social realities, and our services which follow from this are in fact usually unconnected to natural families, relatives, neighborhood or social and economic structures. Our social services rest on a frightenlngly simplistic base: Services focused upon the individual will benefit the individual. It is a bit like worrying about the quality of an automobile without devoting any attention to road construction or repair. We must continue to dignify the individual by serving each particular person as a unique human being, but at the same time we must look at the larger context in which the individual attempts to move. If we do not broaden our focus "...our public policies will be unable to do much more than help individuals repair damage that the environment is constantly reinflicting."[20] Self-sufficiency is a false myth which we constantly perpetuate to the detriment of children, families and the taxpayer.

There is evidence to suggest that parental unconnectedness to larger community support networks can produce results which are harmful to children. Julius Richmond, speaking to a multi-disciplinary conference at the University of Pennsylvania, noted that

> ...because of family separations and inadequate financial resources, parents themselves often lack the kind of emotional and financial support that will allow them to be god or adequate parents... researchers have noted repeatedly that one characteristic of abusing parents is social isolation.[21]

He cited one study by Eli Newberger of Boston Children's Hospital Medical Center which indicated that "the single factor distinguishing child-abusing families from non-abusing families was the absence of a telephone in the child-abusing families."[22]

In addition, it is difficult to think ecologically because many of the forces impinging on children and families are not easily seen, identified or easily changed. When a child is sick, hungry, delinquent or a runaway, the problem is clear, but the cause of the problem remains elusive. So we focus on the manifest problem: the child.

The causes go beyond the child: It is estimated that "...a quarter to a third of all American children are born into families with financial strains so great that their children will suffer basic deprivations."[23] There are often problems because there simply isn't enough money. Because of sheer exhaustion and a struggle for basic economic necessities, a single working mother plunks her child down in front of the television. Because the nearest public health clinic is not on a public transportation route and is not open after work hours, a first-time mother does not receive the proper neo-natal care, thereby jeopardizing her child's life-time potential. Because child care options are not locally available, a mother, stuck in a tiny room in public housing, begins to abuse her children. Because there is no money for respite homemaker services, an enervated father puts his handicapped child up for adoption. Because of the absence of an extended maternity leave policy and because her financial situation is marginal at best, a mother returns to work too soon after childbirth, hemorrhages severely, loses her job and becomes an AFDC mother.

> Categorical, single-strategy programs, while effective in meeting some of the specific needs of many families, have failed to provide the support required by many families with multiple needs.

> In addition to programs specifically directed toward families and children, public policies in many areas have effects, both positive and negative, on the welfare of families. Despite this fact, little explicit attention is given to the impact on families and children of welfare, health, housing, transportation, environmental, criminal justice, recreation, consumer protection and other programs, both old and new...It is therefore not enough to exhort parents to do a better job of caring for their children. Courses in parent education, while helpful, will not resolve the dilemma faced by a single parent who must work full time and who cannot make adequate substitute child care arrangements without sacrificing a reasonable standard of living.[24]

We do not see these interconnected forces, only the results. Simplistically, we continue to concentrate services on the child.

D. A Family's Right to Privacy

Emerging children's rights concerns notwithstanding, the right of a parent to parent has historically been seen as inviolable:

> When the family was the focal point of a child's life and enjoyed a virtual monopoly as the source of education, health services, employment potential and recreational diversion, legal doctrine rested on an assumption that parents had a "natural" or "inalienable" right to raise their children as they saw fit.[25]

Ironically, however, many of our policies and practices turn out to conflict with and even actively erode the strength and integrity of the family. AFDC payment structures may be the classic example. Not only is there a disincentive for the absent husband to return, the single mother is discouraged from working because of the almost immediate loss of income and minimum health coverage. We say that families have a right to disintegrate and that the state will intervene only when the situation becomes serious, and then will focus its attention on the victim - the child. There is an assumption that parents and relatives should not be paid or helped to be parents.[26] It is assumed that love and caring are natural functions, which, if imperfectly performed will result in services to the child. We do not take into consideration that most parents wish to parent properly, but some either do not know how or are too overwhelmed to find the opportunity.

> A 13-year old boy is the son of a prostitute. His mother's boyfriend, her pimp, lives with the mother and the boy. The pimp regularly beats the boy. The boy, wisely, has chosen to spend most of his time with his grandmother who lives two stories below in the housing project. The Department of Public Welfare is alerted to the situation, assesses it and determines that the boy must be removed from his mother - at least temporarily - and placed in foster care. The grandmother offers to assume the foster parenting role if given a sufficient amount of money for food, bedding and clothing. DPW's response is that it is illegal for a relative to receive a foster parent wage, but that the grandmother can apply to become an AFDC mother and file adoption papers for the boy! The grandmother refused to be demeaned by "going on the State." The boy is removed from his mother and grandmother and placed in foster care fifty miles from home.[27]

Thus, our respect for privacy, or more accurately, the right of a family to operate pretty much as it sees fit, does not withstand scrutiny very well. The point is that family policies do exist, if only indirectly.

> ...there is a widespread belief that families are private units, and that government does not and should not intervene in their private affairs. Families have been considered to be largely out of bounds for public policy. As a result, even when public policies have had major effects on families, they are seldom described or analyzed in terms of their family impact. We believe that many public policies have direct effects on families, and that efforts should be made to determine and make known these effects so that the public and its elected representatives can debate and change those policies if they desire.[28]

E. The Law

> ...most U.S. writers about family policy have neglected to consider and analyze state laws and provisions. Yet brief consideration suggests the significance within family policy of the laws of marriage, divorce, annulment, abortion, parent-child relationships, adoption, foster care, child abuse and neglect, waywardness and emancipation of minors...To this add the role of the state in exercising options and therefore deferring or shaping many of the substantive specifics in federal-state programs in which funds are matched and the range of state choice is significant. Included here, for example, are: Supplementation to SSI programs for the aged, blind and disabled; Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC); unemployment insurance; housing; a variety of education programs; a diversity of health programs.[29]

Children in many states are routinely locked up for the crime of disobeying their parents or not getting along with teachers in school. Either

the law allows the state to pull children quickly from families which are in trouble, or the law seems geared to protect parents' rights. Family integrity, or at least permanence, is not the thrust of the law. The law seems to be randomly bouncing between the inviolable nature of parents' rights and the right of a child to be free from abuse, neglect and exploitation (e.g., child labor laws). We should strive for a more holistic view - family integrity and continuity. Our legal response to a family crisis is often to exacerbate the break up, not to support, repair or guarantee permanence elsewhere. By not thinking in this way we are damaging children: "Continuity of relationships, surroundings and environmental influence are essential for a child's normal development. Since they do not play the same role in later life, their importance is often underrated by the adult world."30

F. Studies - Research

> ...the prevailing research model, based on experimentation in laboratory settings, is limited to a narrow conception of the child's environment...The prevailing research model described is hardly characteristic of the situations in which children actually live and develop.31

Bronfenbrenner, too, argues that our research has tended to take place in unnatural environments, far removed from the child's natural context. The children of divorced parents, at least temporarily, show disruptive behavior, poorer school performance and reveal feelings of anxiety, insecurity and inadequacy. Divorced parents seem to be less communicative, more inconsistent and use more negative sanctions on their children. A narrow look would blame the fact of divorce alone. A more ecological interpretation reveals a new picture:

> These developmental disruptions do not seem to be attributable mainly to father absence but to stresses and a lack of support systems that result in changed family functioning for the single mother and her children...32

A larger look gives us vital information about why widowed parents and their children seem mentally healthier than their divorced single-parent counterparts:

> It would appear that, at least in American society, a single mother left with the care of a young child is treated differently depending on whether the marriage was ended by death or by divorce. As a result, women finding themselves in these positions are subject to different sets of pressures and react accordingly. This phenomenon shows the operations of another critical element of the microsystem - social role - which interests us as it functions to stimulate, maintain and, on occasion, dramatically redirect the course of human development.33

Head Start provides another good example. We have looked at: Optimum student/teacher ratios; the effects of architecture and light on children; the influence of certain types of educational materials; how Head Start children perform in public schools; the impact of health services upon Head Start children, etc. But have we looked in any detail at the effects of the Head Start program upon parents? Does a mother's involvement as a Head Start parent persist into the public schools? Does the parent have a different view of parenting as a result of Head Start (views on family size, amount of TV that should be watched, amount of time spent with the child)? Does a Head Start parent attempt to improve her or his educational status? The Family Impact Seminar does not equivocate.

> The social scientists who developed the theory and research on which this approach is based viewed human beings primarily as isolated entities, and searched for single, linear cause and effect determinants of behavior. Darwin and his followers had, for example, emphasized genetic determinants of behavior. Freudians emphasized the critical importance of early experiences of the child with his mother (and sometimes father) on later adult behavior. And although behavioral and educational psychologists following from Skinner were among the first to be interested in the effect of the immediate environment on animals and humans, their studies usually concentrated narrowly on developing stimulus and response theories along similar linear cause and effect models. Thus, the majority of research psychologists, educators, and mental health professionals have been concerned primarily with observing, teaching, and treating children and

adults as isolated individuals in laboratories, testing rooms, classrooms, doctors' offices and hospital wards. And their views greatly influenced the structure and design of many health, educational and social programs.[34]

If we accept the notion that a focus on the individual is but half the battle, then our research thinking must begin to reflect more ecological concerns.

III. Reasons for The Present Concern

Concern about families is inescapable. It has crept into the media, political rhetoric, budget formulations and personal lives. The church is worried:

> ...young Roman Catholics in the diocese of Phoenix...wishing to marry in the church have been required to give their priest six months' advance notice..Arizona Catholics' marriages are breaking up at a rate similar to the general population's...The Phoenix rationale is straightforward. Marriage is a vocation. "You cannot become a plumber or an electrician in two weeks," remarks the priest who heads the diocesan tribunal..."it will take hard work...for Catholics to resist the trend to treat marriage and divorce casually."[35]

The Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare is changing its social service focus:

> The Massachusetts Public Welfare Department is revising its policies on the care and protection of abused and neglected children to place more emphasis on keeping the children in their own homes, rather than placing them in foster homes...John McManus, director of social services for the Department said..."It will be a marked change in the way we operate...the signed agreement will put more pressure on us to come to a formal agreement with a child's parents on what we are going to do for the child and for them, and it will put pressure on the parents to really look at what their problems are."[36]

Judges are worried:

> Every Tuesday the blue-serge-uniformed officers clear out one of the session rooms at the Quincy District Court for three or four disillusioning hours. For the rest of the afternoon, the courtroom is secured and the public is barred. During these hours, Judge Albert L. Kramer deals with the shattered families of troubled children whose seemingly unsolvable problems have brought them to the weekly session...

> The experiences have led Kramer to join in a federal court suit protesting the failure of the state's Public Welfare Department to properly investigate such cases and its failure to develop appropriate plans for helping the families and children involved..."I have never seen in all the cases before me where the Department has provided services to a child's parents...even when the removal is temporary and the child's return home is imminent...We're getting more conservative about taking kids out of their homes. The more you get involved you find out it usually does more harm than good to take them out except when their lives are in danger.[37]

The Massachusetts Department of Youth Services is experimenting:

> The Department has for several years been serving delinquent youths as isolated persons which neglects the reality of the enormous strength and potential of family influences. As a result rehabilitative efforts have been weakened or sabotaged and siblings have joined our primary clients in delinquent behavior. This narrow approach to rehabilitation of delinquents is not only not cost effective but it tends to divide and weaken the family rather than strengthen it. The need for family counseling was clearly demonstrated in our 1978 survey.[38]

Some private companies are re-thinking personnel policies:

> As women in recent years have entered the work world in unprecedented numbers, maternity leaves have become fairly standard in corporate labor contracts. But two-career families and the changing role of both parents in the home have resulted in a new subject for contract negotiations: paternity leaves...WGBH is one of a number of companies in Greater Boston that offer time off to expectant fathers... Doris Mitchell, vice president of personnel at AET Associates, a Cambridge-based social policy research firm that has a plan similar to that at WGBH said that the purpose of a paternity leave is "to recognize that child-care is not just a woman's thing, but a parents' thing."[39]

It is encouraging to see these discussions occurring. The reasons for concern at this particular time in our history are traceable. Divorce rates are sky-rocketing: "Estimates from death and divorce rates indicate that nearly 40 percent of the children born around 1970 will experience a parental death, divorce or separation and consequently live in a one-parent family at some point during their first eighteen years."[40] The glue of tradition provided by churches, neighborhoods and job stability has been loosened to the point where

most people feel quite free about their options -whether or not to marry, have children, separate or divorce. Some have called the cult of "me" or the "new narcissism" the main culprit. It is the fault of the State, asserts Lasch, that we are too pre-occupied with our own pleasure to be worried about the next generation:

> The atrophy of older traditions of self-help has eroded everyday competence in one area after another and has made the individual dependent on the state, the corporation and other bureaucracies. Narcissism represents the psychological dimension of this dependence.[41]

Women are entering the labor market in unprecedented numbers and are thereby effectively challenging our fundamental conceptions about parenting and breadwinning. "As of March 1975, 52 percent of married women with children aged 6-17 were working or looking for work; in 1948, the rate was 26 percent.[42] Kahn and Kamerman maintain that the working woman is one of the prime reasons we are thinking about families today.[43]

Economics also plays a big part. The economic crisis faced by the working poor has a powerful effect on family life. To the extent that families imply the presence of children, "...At 1977 prices, a family of four earning between $16,500 and $20,000 a year can expect to spend $54,297 to support a child to the age of 18, excluding the expense of higher education."[44]

Some feminists may reject motherhood as a viable option, while pro- and anti-abortion forces argue publicly, each accusing the other of an anti-family bias. Out-of-wedlock births have increased from one of every twenty giving birth in 1960 to one in eight today.[45] Mobility, which makes neighborhood attachments difficult, reveals that "...the average American moves fourteen times in his or her lifetime and twenty percent of our population moves each year...more than 600,000 children continue to be born each year to teenage mothers and these children have a higher than average risk of birth defects."[46]

Finally, in a number of European countries, a slow-down in population growth has triggered national attention, and in some cases, national family policy: "The threat of a dwindling population serves Swedish family policy as its official godmother".[47]

In the face of these seemingly alarming trends and statistics stands Mary Jo Bane who, while acknowledging that the American family needs attention and assistance, urges us to look hard at what the data is really telling us:

> Discontinuities in parental care are no greater than they were in the past...changes in fertility rates may lead to an environment that, according to generally agreed on criteria, is more beneficial for children.
>
> Decreasing family size rather than increasing childlessness accounts for most of the declining fertility in the United States.
>
> The data on childlessness and family size, in short, do not suggest a societal abandonment of children.
>
> The data suggest that the proportion of children who live with at least one of their parents rather than with relatives, with foster parents, or in institutions has been steadily rising...the proportion of children living with at least one of their parents in a separate household has gone steadily up, from about 90 percent in 1940 to almost 95 percent in 1970.
>
> ...there has been no significant emancipation of teenagers from their families. In comparison with nineteenth-century teenagers in urban areas, in fact, contemporary teenage boys are much more dependent on their parents for shelter and support. What they do at home is another matter, but they do live there.
>
> None of the statistical data suggests that parental watchfulness over children has decreased over the span of three generations; much suggests that it has increased.
>
> In general, the remarriage rate has kept pace with the divorce rate, suggesting that it is not marriage itself but the specific marital partner that is rejected...And even if the proportion of singles rises slightly, it will still be among the smallest in history.[48]

According to Bane, family and parenting configurations may change, but the modern American family as an institution is resilient and durable, harboring strengths that should be recognized and taken advantage of.

IV. Principles - A Framework for Inquiry

With the above as background, we can return to a consideration of the role of the Family Committee. As previously suggested, the Committee should neither promulgate policy nor presume that its actions will lead inevitably to a comprehensive family policy for the State. Rather, its presence will formalize the State's commitment to a family perspective and to a consideration of the impact that several state agencies have on families.

This seems to be the bias of Kamerman and Kahn:

> Still another definition of family policy - probably the most recent - is its use as perspective or criterion for social policy choice. Such an approach could apply to all policy arenas - tax policy, transportation, military policy, land use and so forth - and suggests the use of family well-being as one of the criteria for decision-making as well as an outcome for assessing the consequences of policies generally. Although it is this definition that we ourselves find most attractive...[49]

The Committee should first arrive at some general agreement about the basis of its inquiries. It should share, to the greatest extent possible, a common set of assumptions or principles. Suggested principles follow. (Many of the principles apply only to human service agencies, others are generally applicable).

A. Accessibility

> Why did you put me in a foster home in Barnstable? There isn't any busses from Brockton to Barnstable. My mom could never get to see me.[50]

Situations like this must be stopped. Families must be able to reach the services they need. Services should be community-based if at all possible. Families must be able to visit their children if temporary removal from home is necessary.

B. Comprehensiveness and Decentralization

It is not uncommon for a troubled family to be crawling with different workers from different agencies with different intake criteria from different parts of the city or state. Mother might be seeing a Mental Health alcoholism counselor, father a vocational counselor, brother a probation officer, sister a school adjustment counselor and older brother a Welfare CHINS (Children in Need of Services) worker. Besides inefficiencies, such a bewildering array of helpers confuses and demeans the family. Troubled families should see one worker - a family services worker - who can either deliver the services personally or broker the necessary services. This will require a common language among human service agencies, a somewhat common intake form, and much inter-agency cooperation and memoranda of understanding. It will almost certainly mean the eventual merger of those agencies serving troubled youth and their families, at a minimum Youth Services, Welfare and the children's portion of Mental Health. This also suggests the existence of locally-based family and children's service centers whose budgets are controlled and programs created at the lowest possible level (an area) and whose programs are monitored and overseen by a central office.

We have a jungle of programs affecting families:

> At least 268 programs (as listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance) provide direct financial assistance or services to individuals and families and have potential impact on families...countless other federal policies have substantial impact on families, including tax policies, court decisions, government employment practices, general revenue sharing, policies of regulatory agencies and macroeconomic policies...51

In addition to confusion and overlap, we have structurally removed ourselves from families. Welfare was once the responsibility of towns. Although there were cases of dramatic inequity (Newton was known as a good Welfare town, Fall River terrible, and Boston varied depending on the section of the city in which one lived), workers assumed responsibility for families. But Welfare decentralized its functions.

> I was responsible for everything. I knew the families. Before, when I gave the mother her AFDC check, I would always talk to her husband about his drinking. I knew about jobs open in the city and take him there to work. Then Welfare put everything in the Central Office. They gave me Good Stamps. Somebody else did AFDC, another person General Relief and so on. I would only deal with a piece of the family, and I had cases all over eastern Massachusetts. I couldn't get to know the families. I didn't know when jobs were available. I didn't think I was helping anybody, so I quit.[52]

C. Stigma

Ideally, services should be provided on a sliding fee scale so that services are not perceived as the last resort for the poor and defeated. In addition, Family and Children's Centers seem less demeaning doors to walk through than doors marked "Welfare" or "Mental Health."

D. Integration

Services must be available for both sexes of all races and agencies must have the linguistic capacity to respond properly to the needs of non-English speaking people.

E. Participation

> You know, I'm really proud of my mom. She talked to my principal. They may take me back in school.[53]

Many children and families have been helpees all their lives. Probably the greatest gift we can give to families is a sense of empowerment, i.e., imparting the skills which will allow them to negotiate the system. Unfortunately, the normative mode of operation is to provide services, not provide the ability to obtain these services. Are parents part of the design of treatment plans for their children? Do they know their rights? Are they consulted when their child is removed from foster care placement and moved? Are they perceived

only as helpless? Teaching families how to confront landlords, speak with school officials and "negotiate the system" are examples of how we might "empower" families.

F. Family Focus

> Present human service systems tend to fragment and undermine the family. All such delivery systems should be directed to provide services and supports through and to the family as a unit with recognition of the different needs, strengths and weaknesses of varying family forms.[54]

This means quite simply that what we do must be seen in terms of its effect on families. For example, plans drafted for a delinquent youth must indicate, at a minimum, how that youth's family will be affected. Ideally there should be service plans for families. This applies not only to human service agencies. President Carter has given serious thought to requiring all federal agencies to submit family impact statements (e.g., Defense, etc.) much analogous to "environmental impact statements."

F. Family Services

We must initiate programs for families. Out of home placements are inevitable in certain cases, but we must ask why family support programs are not in place. Family programs, since they are not a traditional part of our service spectrum, appear to be extremely vulnerable. As we have seen, the State is beginning to talk a very good game about families, but the gap between rhetoric and reality is quite large. On June 11, 1979 the Deputy Director of Welfare's Office of Social Services observed that:

> Reduction of homemaker time can result in costly foster care: Recently the maximum number of hours for which homemakers can service families was substantially reduced. We are already receiving complaints that this reduction is forcing some relatives (e.g., elderly grandparents) to be unable to continue caring for children. For example, in one such case, two children may have to go into expensive foster homes since their grandmother,

> who is handicapped, cannot provide physical care. There is no question that the children are better off with a blood relative, yet without homemaker support a family may be dismantled.[55]

H. Accountability and Monitoring

All programs for children and families must be monitored at least annually by a combination of credentialled professionals, interested citizens (through local councils and boards) and clients. Programs must be accountable to the funding source and to the locales they serve. Such monitoring implies the existence of standards.

I. Data

Data must be assembled in such a way that we can see what is happening to children and families. There must be a common language among human service agencies.

J. Prevention

> An overriding goal of each agency should be to minimize dependency on the human service system. Emphasis should be placed on early identification and intervention whenever these services will avoid larger problems for the individual in the future.[56]

Three fundamental pillars - schools, jobs and health - must be strengthened. They are basic to family and child health. We are often too quick to pass children on to the Welfare or Youth Services systems when the solution might be the utilization of strengthened and expanded mechanisms that are perceived of as more natural and which are, thereby, more generally accepted (e.g., the local school and health systems).

K. Measurement - Outcomes

> We in human services are able to make dramatic and convincing statements of need: We know how many teenage girls become

> pregnant and give up children for adoption; we can project roughly the number of abuse and neglect cases which will be reported; we know the shockingly high rate of minority teen unemployment...But what we cannot do is demonstrate what seems to work...[57]

The launching of family initiatives must be accompanied by the tools to measure such initiatives. We should be able to determine whether family-focused services are more effective and what the cost implications are.

L. Training

Training which concentrates solely on the counselor/counselee relationship must be expanded to include family work and the social and economic pressures which bear upon families. The mode of our present training in the human services area (pre- and in-service) may be one of the major factors retarding a family-focused human service delivery system.

M. Confidentiality

Whenever possible, client information should be maintained at the level closest to the delivery of service. In order to safeguard client data, agencies must comply with the provisions of MGL c66A and related federal statutes and regulations.

N. Permanence

The present condition of children languishing in uncertain foster care placements and waiting year after year for adoption proceedings to inch forward must cease. Our guiding principle must be permanence:

> This means that all child placements, excepts where specifically designed for brief temporary care, shall be as permanent as the placement of a newborn with its biological parents.[58]

V. Sample Questions

We are now prepared to outline questions the Committee might ask of each agency. The sample questions which follow should flow naturally from the principles enumerated above. Eventually, the Committee should have a detailed set of questions tailored specifically to the unique mandates of each state agency. This paper will concentrate most of its attention on the Human Service agencies for obvious reasons (their goals most directly affect children and families), but it will touch upon other units of government as well. The questions listed below are only illustrative and presume in no way to be exhaustive. Additionally, the order of the questions has no meaning.

A. Human Services (all agencies in the Human Service family, such as the Chelsea Soldiers' Home, are not reviewed).

1. The Department of Public Welfare (DPW)

a. What is the content of staff training?

b. Are family impact statements required when children are removed from their families?

c. Are services provided to families when children are removed from them?

d. What programs currently exist for children at home?

e. Is there a time limit set on foster care placement before decisions are made either to return a child to its biological family or to begin adoption proceedings?

f. Can DPW's data tell us anything about families?

g. When placement out of the home is indicated, is thought given to placement with relatives? Are there obstacles to this practice?

h. Is money available for parents to visit their children in placement?

i. How many children are placed out of state? Why? Do criteria exist for such placement?

j. Do parents receive program reports on the status of their children who are in placement?

k. Are families afforded the opportunity to influence or appeal placement decisions?

l. Do sufficient day care slots exist?

m. How are DPW's children's programs monitored? What is the role of local citizen groups? Of families?

n. What organizational barriers exist which inhibit family work? (e.g., case load size, geographic distribution)

o. Do families know their rights?

p. What are the grounds for terminating parental rights? Who has the authority to initiate termination proceedings? Is there a right to counsel? What procedural safeguards are provided to the child and parent at the hearing?[59]

q. How are children guaranteed permanent families?

r. What outcome studies are being performed about children and their families?

s. Do any state or federal policies or regulations hamper service delivery to children and families? Has there been a comprehensive review of such policies?

t. As a matter of policy, are children placed as close to home as possible?

u. Why have services to families (e.g., Homemaker Services) been cut back?

v. What is the role of the family when treatment plans are being developed for children?

w. In child abuse cases, what is the responsibility of the DPW worker toward the abusing parent?

2. The Department of Youth Services (DYS)

Many of the questions asked of DPW are applicable to DYS also.

Supplemental questions might be:

a. Does each out-of-home DYS program have a family dimension? (This is especially critical for youth in locked settings).

b. What is the understanding regarding visits from parents?

c. Can DYS pay visitation costs if parents cannot afford it?

d. Does DYS as a matter of policy and practice place youth in the least restrictive settings which are close to home?

e. What inter-agency understandings exist? What is DYS' relationship with local school systems, public health institutions and job-finding agencies?

f. What does DYS know about the families of its clients?

g. As a matter of course, does DYS include the family when it designs treatment plans for youth? Does it provide services or see that services are given to deserving families of the youth in its care?

h. Has there been any research on DYS' experimental family programs?

i. Do the DYS monitoring and evaluation efforts include local citizens and/or boards?

3. The Department of Mental Health (DMH)

Most of the questions asked above apply here also. Some additional ones include:

a. Does DMH's view of community mental health include family mental health? How?

b. Does DMH have any programs specifically for families?

c. What respite programs exist for the families of mentally retarded youth?

d. What programs exist for drug-dependent parents?

4. The Department of Public Health (DPH)

Again, questions applicable to DPH can be culled from those posed above. Additions might include:

a. What does public health mean? Does it mean family health? How?

b. Are DPH clinics available to the poor?

c. Does sufficient pre- and neo-natal care exist?

d. What is DPH doing about prevention? What is DPH's health education program for families?

e. Are the Department of Public Health and the Executive Office of Education coordinating program efforts in the areas of smoking, substance abuse, sex and venereal disease?

f. How are citizens involved in community health issues?

g. How is DPH looking at family alcoholism?

h. Are doctors free to provide contraceptive advice to teenagers?

i. Do the families of physically handicapped children receive respite care services?

j. What is the extent of the Early Periodic Screening and Diagnostic Program? (EPSDP)

5. Office of the Secretary of Human Services

a. What is being done to reduce inter-agency squabbling and turf guarding?

b. Do plans exist for a common data system? Would this system reflect a family focus?

c. What is the potential for the establishment of a locally-based family and children's service center?

d. How are human service goals tied to the economic goals set by the state?

e. Have agencies been asked to review all regulations and enabling statutes for an anti-family bias?

B. Other State Agencies

This will be a brief overview, touching only some of the State's non-human service departments, and asking questions which do not presume to be comprehensive.

1. The Executive Office of Educational Affairs

a. What is the Office's view toward family life (parenting) courses? Do curriculum models exist? Is the Office advocating such teaching in local schools?

b. What responsibility does the Office have toward the parents of troubled youth?

c. Are pregnant adolescents expelled from school systems or educated in regular education programs? What programs exist for teen mothers? What day care programs exist as a part of a school program?

d. Is the 766 mandate being evenly implemented?

e. Does the Office have a close working relationship with the Department of Manpower Affairs and the Mass. Rehabilitation Commission to properly serve the older adolescent who is in danger of dropping out?

f. What connections exist between Day Care, Head Start and local public schools?

g. Are parents guaranteed the right to participate in educational decisions about their children?

2. Judiciary

a. Are specific criteria set for removal of children from home (e.g., CHINS cases)?

b. What criteria exist for child custody decisions?

c. Do judges receive special training when dealing with children and families in custody, adoption and divorce proceedings?

d. What new thinking is occurring in the area of family law?

e. Are juvenile court judges expected to deal with families? How? Is a standard practice expected?

3. The Executive

a. What role should the Governor's office play in assisting the families of Massachusetts?

b. What family-based initiatives is LEAA (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration) funding? Family law efforts?

4. Administration and Finance

a. What is the present policy of the Division of Personnel Administration regarding maternity leave? Paternity leave? Flextime?

5. Environmental Affairs

a. Are all parks usable by children and families?

b. Under the Department of Food and Agriculture, what messages are being given to families regarding nutritional habits?

6. Communities and Development

a. Does "community development" include family development?

b. To what extent is there local (neighborhood) participation in the decisions of the Division of Community Development?

7. Transportation and Construction

   a. Given that roads usually do not disturb golf courses but aim for poorer, more vulnerable neighborhoods, are family or neighborhood impact statements required by the Bureau of Transportation or the Division of Construction before roads are built?

   b. Is regular public transportation available to those in the lowest income areas?

8. Manpower Affairs

   a. How are the State's economic goals related to Human Service's goals?

   b. Are new commercial ventures encouraged to locate near poverty (hence, high family disruption) areas?

   c. Given that the families of youth eligible for CETA youth programs are often troubled, what does the Department view as its responsibility toward these parents?

   d. What is the position of the Department of Labor and Industries regarding maternity and paternity leaves?

9. Elder Affairs

   a. How are decisions made when the elderly are placed out of homes? Are families and neighborhoods taken into consideration?

   b. What family and neighborhood service projects are available for elderly citizens?

   c. Do foster grandparent programs exist for non-institutional kids?

10. Consumer Affairs

   a. Is the basic consumer unit an individual or a family?

   b. Do any family-oriented consumer initiatives exist?

VI. Conclusion

Governor King's Committee presents the State (and perhaps the country) with a rare opportunity. Concerns regarding families and the recent spate of rhetoric swirling around family issues can descend from the speculative clouds and harness themselves to a new and viable political mechanism. The ethic of how the state conducts its work and the state's attitudes toward families can change dramatically and it can change quickly.

The suggested role for the Committee - a lens - is not a radical one. This paper suggests that when the State does its business, it should seriously and formally consider the effects its activities will have on families. It is a practical and exciting beginning.

Footnotes

1. Edward J. King, Governor, "Family Services Provided by the Commonwealth," Memorandum to Secretary Charles Johnson (Boston, April 20, 1979).

2. From private conversations this author has had with the Governor and from the Governor's public speeches and comments.

3. Laurence E. Lynn, Jr., "Fiscal and Organizational Constraints on Family Policy," Speech before International Seminar on Family Policy, University of Notre Dame (South Bend, Indiana, March 16, 1978), p. 2.

4. Family Impact Seminar, Interim Report, (Washington, D.C., April, 1978), p. 9.

5. Mother of a 16-year old son (committed to DYS for the third time) in Brockton, Mass., as told to this author, then Commissioner of the Department of Youth Services (November, 1978).

6. Children's Defense Fund, Children Without Homes, (Washington, D.C., 1978), p. xiii.

7. National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Toward a National Policy for Children and Families, (Washington, 1976), p. 12.

8. Joseph Featherstone, "Family Matters," Harvard Education Review, Vol. 49, No. 1 (Cambridge, February, 1979), p. 33.

9. Kenneth Keniston, All Our Children, (New York, 1977), p. 9.

10. Alan R. Gruber, Foster Home Care in Massachusetts (Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 1973).

11. Family Impact Seminar, p. 13.

12. Urie Bronfenbrenner, The Ecology of Human Development, (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 2, 7.

13. Christopher Lasch, Haven in a Heartless World, (New York, 1977), p. 37.

14. Ibid., p. 189.

15. Tamara K. Hareven and John Modell, "Urbanization and the Malleable Household: An Examination of Boarding and Lodging in American Families," The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective, Ed. Michael Gordon (New York, 1978), p. 52.

16. Peter Dobkin Hall, "Marital Selection and Business in Massachusetts Merchant Families, 1700-1900," Ed. Michael Gordon, p. 101.

17. John Modell, Frank Furstenberg, Theodore Hershberg, "Social Change and Transitions to Adulthood in Historical Perspective," Ed. Gordon, p. 214.

18. Featherstone, pp. 42-43.

19. Ibid., p. 45.

20. Keniston, p. xiii.

21. The Boston Globe, November 22, 1978, p. 22.

22. Ibid.

23. Keniston, p. 26.

24. National Research Council, pp. 3-4.

25. Keniston, p. 183.

26. Children's Defense Fund, p. 21.

27. This case told to the author by a Welfare executive during the "Adolescent Task Force Hearings," Spring, 1978.

28. Family Impact Seminar, p. 7.

29. Sheila B. Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn, Editors, Family Policy: Government and Families in Fourteen Countries, (New York, 1978), p. 433.

30. Joseph Goldstein, Anna Freud, Albert J. Solnit, Beyond the Best Interests of the Child, (New York, 1973), pp. 31-32.

31. National Research Council, p. 100.

32. Bronfenbrenner, p. 78.

33. Ibid., p. 82.

34. Family Impact Seminar, p. 14.

35. Time Magazine, July 16, 1978, p. 59.

36. The Boston Sunday Globe, July 15, 1978, p. 24.

37. The Boston Globe, October 23, 1978, p. 15.

38. The Massachusetts Department of Youth Services, "Budget Recommendations of His Excellency Edward J. King, Governor, to the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts," (Boston, February 28, 1979), p. 18.

39. The Boston Globe, August 2, 1979, p. 21.

40. Mary Jo Bane, Here To Stay, (New York, 1976), p. 14.

41. In These Times, May 23-29, 1979, p. 20.

42. National Research Council, p. 15.

43. Kamerman and Kahn, p. 12.

44. Newsweek, May 15, 1978, p. 64.

45. Joseph A. Califano, Jr., "American Families: Trends, Pressures and Recommendations - A Preliminary Report to Governor Jimmy Carter," Fall, 1976, p. 4.

46. Ibid.

47. Rita Liljestrom, "Sweden," Family Policy: Government and Families in Fourteen Countries, Ed. Kamerman and Kahn, p. 19.

48. Bane, pp. 4, 12-13, 19, 34-35.

49. Kamerman and Kahn, p. 7.

50. Youth in the care of DYS as told to this author, June, 1979.

51. Family Impact Seminar, p. 51.

52. Assistant Chief of the Waltham Police Department as told to this author, October, 1978.

53. Youth in the care of DYS as told to this author, June, 1979.

54. National Research Council, p. 95.

55. Loretta W. Kowal, "Interagency Family Projects," Letter to Janice Barrett, (Boston, June 11, 1979), p. 2.

56. John A. Calhoun, Adolescent Services in Massachusetts, (Boston, November 12, 1978), p. 5.

57. Ibid., p. ii.

58. Goldstein, Freud and Solnit, p. 35.

59. Children's Defense Fund, p. 81.

Bibliography

A. Books

Mary Jo Bane, Here To Stay, (New York, 1976), p. 14.

Urie Bronfenbrenner, The Ecology of Human Development, (Cambridge, 1979).

Children's Defense Fund, Children Without Homes, (Washington, D.C., 1978).

Joseph Goldstein, Anna Freud, Albert J. Solnit, Beyond the Best Interests of the Child, (New York, 1973).

Michael Gordon, Editor, The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective, (New York, 1978).

Sheila B. Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn, Editors, Family Policy: Government and Families in Fourteen Countries, (New York, 1978).

Kenneth Keniston, All Our Children, (New York, 1977).

Christopher Lasch, Haven in a Heartless World, (New York, 1977).

National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Toward a National Policy for Children and Families, (Washington, 1976).

B. Monographs

John A. Calhoun, Adolescent Services in Massachusetts, (Boston, November 12, 1978).

Family Impact Seminar, Interim Report, (Washington, D.C., April, 1978).

Alan R. Gruber, Foster Home Care in Massachusetts (Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 1973).

C. Articles, Reports, Memos and State Documents

The Boston Globe (various editions)

The Massachusetts Department of Youth Services, "Budget Recommendations of His Excellency Edward J. King, Governor, to the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts," (Boston, February 28, 1979).

Joseph A. Califano, Jr., "American Families: Trends, Pressures and Recommendations - A Preliminary Report to Governor Jimmy Carter," Fall, 1976.

Joseph Featherstone, "Family Matters," Harvard Education Review, Vol. 49, No. 1 (Cambridge, February, 1979).

In These Times, May 23-29, 1979.

Edward J. King, Governor, "Family Services Provided by the Commonwealth," Memorandum to Secretary Charles Johnson (Boston, April 20, 1979).

Loretta W. Kowal, "Interagency Family Projects," Letter to Janice Barrett, (Boston, June 11, 1979).

Laurence E. Lynn, Jr., "Fiscal and Organizational Constraints on Family Policy," Speech before International Seminar on Family Policy, University of Notre Dame (South Bend, Indiana, March 16, 1978).

Newsweek, May 15, 1978.

Time Magazine, July 16, 1978.